

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 08-1528**

---

CHAO ZHENG,

Petitioner,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, JR., Attorney General,

Respondent.

---

On Petition for Review of an Order of the Board of Immigration Appeals.

---

Submitted: April 7, 2009

Decided: May 20, 2009

---

Before NIEMEYER, TRAXLER, and GREGORY, Circuit Judges.

---

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Yan Wang, New York, New York, for Petitioner. Gregory G. Katsas, Assistant Attorney General, William C. Peachey, Matthew A. Spurlock, OFFICE OF IMMIGRATION LITIGATION, Washington, D.C., for Respondent.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Chao Zheng, a native and citizen of China, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("Board") order affirming the immigration judge's order denying his application for asylum, withholding of removal, and protection under the Convention Against Torture. Zheng challenges the immigration judge's adverse credibility finding, as affirmed by the Board. For the reasons set forth below, we deny the petition for review.

We will uphold an adverse credibility determination if it is supported by substantial evidence, see Tewabe v. Gonzales, 446 F.3d 533, 538 (4th Cir. 2006), and reverse the Board's decision only if the evidence "was so compelling that no reasonable fact finder could fail to find the requisite fear of persecution." Rusu v. INS, 296 F.3d 316, 325 n.14 (4th Cir. 2002) (internal quotations and citations omitted).

Having reviewed the administrative record and the Board's decision, we find that substantial evidence supports the immigration judge's adverse credibility finding, as affirmed by the Board, and the ruling that Zheng failed to establish past persecution or a well-founded fear of future persecution as necessary to establish eligibility for asylum. See 8 U.S.C. § 1158(b)(1)(B)(I), (ii) (2006) (providing that the burden of

proof is on the alien to establish eligibility for asylum); 8 C.F.R. § 1208.13(a) (2006) (same). Because the record does not compel a different result, we will not disturb the Board's denial of Zheng's application for asylum, withholding of removal, and protection under the Convention Against Torture.

Accordingly, we deny the petition for review. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

PETITION DENIED